

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 2-22 remain in this application. Claims 23-26, which were previously withdrawn, have been canceled. Independent claims 2 and 12 have been amended.

**Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)**

The Office Action rejected independent claims 2, 12 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,785,272 to Sugihara (the Sugihara reference). With respect to claim 2, the Sugihara fails to disclose at least, “assigning a primary communication management module and a secondary communication management module; assigning, *by the primary communications management module*, a unique identifier to each of the plurality of stack switches, the identifies specifying a management hierarchy of the respective switches...”.

With respect to claim 12, the Sugihara reference fails to disclose at least, “a primary communication management module associated with a unique identifier, said primary communication management module specifying a management hierarchy of the stack switch with respect to the plurality of stack switches...”.

With respect to claim 21, the Sugihara reference fails to disclose at least, “if first in the management hierarchy of the three or more of stack switches, to: solicit configuration information updates from each of the other three or more stack switch, and transmit said configuration information from each of the other three or more stack switch to each of the other three or more stack switches...”.

As each and every element of the present invention is not disclosed, taught or rendered obvious by the Sugihara or any of the cited references, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of claims 2-11, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and therefore incorporate all the limitations of claim 1 therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, Applicants assert that these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Regarding the rejection of claims 13-20, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 12, and therefore incorporate all the limitations of claim 12

**Reply Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 – Expedited Procedure**

Serial No. 10/751,098

Examiner Nguyen Hoang Ngo

therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 12, Applicants assert that these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Regarding the rejection of claim 22, as this claim depends from independent claim 21, and therefore incorporate all the limitations of claim 21 therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 21, Applicants assert that this claim is also patentable over the cited references.

It is believed that the foregoing amendment places the Application in condition for allowance; therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of claims 2-22 as set forth in the Office Action, and full allowance of same.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Jessica Smith at (972) 240-5324 to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

GARLICK HARRISON & MARKISON

Dated: May 19, 2008

/Jessica W. Smith/

Jessica W. Smith

Reg. No. 39,884

Garlick Harrison & Markison

P. O. Box 160727

Austin, TX 78716-0727

Phone: (972) 240-5324

Fax: (469) 366-6731